

-4-

**REMARKS**

The present response is filed with a Request for Continued Examination (RCE), and responds to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on May 30, 2003, made Final. Claims 1 and 3-5 are standing for examination. Claims 1 and 4-5 are indicated as rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maxemchuk (U.S. 6,219,346), hereinafter Maxemchuk, in view of Pepe (U.S. 5,714,905), hereinafter Pepe. The applicant believes the Examiner meant to state that claims 1 and 3-5 are thus rejected, and has treated the action thusly.

Applicant has again carefully studied the prior art references cited and applied by the Examiner, and the Examiner's rejections and statements of the instant Office Action. In response, applicant herein amends the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter regarded as patentable, and to distinguish clearly and unarguably over the prior art cited and applied by the Examiner. Applicant further points out and argues the key and patentable aspects of applicant's invention, as embodied in the limitations of applicant's claims as amended, which provides the advantageous distinctions over the prior art.

Applicant herein amends claim 1 to specifically recite remotely editing routing profiles unique to their own communicator IDs, while disconnected from the base station or transceivers, and uploading the pre-edited profiles to the base station or transceivers. Applicant reproduces claim 1 as amended below for convenience.

Applicant's claim 1 as amended now recites:

-5-

*1. (Currently Amended) A data network telephony (DNT) system, comprising:*

*a base station connected to a DNT-capable data network and to a plurality of wireless transceivers, each transceiver transmitting to a distinct area, the base station adapted to operate the transceivers by a two-way, narrow-band, multiple-channel, real-time duplex radio protocol;*

*a plurality of portable computer-enhanced client communicator units, including microphone and speaker apparatus, each assigned a unique address and adapted to communicate with the base station via the transceivers by the two-way real-time radio protocol and to process DNT calls; and*

*a personal router application executable on the base station, transceivers and client communicator units;*

*characterized in that the wireless system operates as a carrier-sense multiple access system with collision detection (CSMA/CD), and further characterized in that individual clients are enabled, through the personal router application, to remotely edit routing rules unique to their own communicator IDs, at the client communicator device, regardless of whether or not the client device is connected to, and communicating with the base station or transceivers, and to upload the edited rules to the base station or transceivers for programming alternative actions for incoming calls.*

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner maintains from the previous Office Action that Maxemchuk discloses substantially the limitations of applicant's claim, with the exception that Maxemchuk does not disclose a personal router application executable on the base station, transceivers and client communicator units, and individual clients are enabled, through the personal router application, to remotely edit routing rules for their own communicator IDs and to upload the edited rules to the base station or one of the transceivers for programming alternative actions for incoming calls. The Examiner relies on Pepe for disclosing

-6-

these deficiencies. The Examiner has stated that the PDA of Pepe executes the software for using to edit routing rules and uploading it to a server which has a routing application for executing the routing information and the PDA interacts with the server and personal routing functions, and it therefore would have been obvious at the time of the invention to combine the teachings to produce applicant's claimed invention.

In the previous response filed by applicant March 13, 2003, applicant argued that Pepe does not disclose a personal router application executable at the client device for programming the routing rules and uploading the programmed routing rules to the base station and/or transceiver in order to redirect the incoming calls. The Examiner has stated in response that Pepe discloses a PDA including a software for programming the arriving rules and uploading to the PCI server which is coupled to the base stations for receiving the incoming call, and redirecting the incoming call according to the uploaded preprogrammed routing rules, so that the PCI server can reroute the incoming call to the forwarded number without receiving the incoming call at the PDA by using call command software at the server/PDA. The Examiner maintains that the teaching of Maxemchuk/Pepe, therefore, performs the claimed invention.

Applicant's claim 1 now recites remotely editing routing rules for their own communicator IDs, regardless of whether or not the client device is connected to and communicating with the base station or transceivers, and, upon re-connection and communication with the base station or transceivers, to upload the pre-edited rules to the base station or transceivers. Applicant argues that Maxemchuk/Pepe now fails to produce applicant's invention as claimed, because Pepe does not teach or suggest the capability for pre-editing a rule set, regardless of the connection status between the client device and the base station or transceivers.

-7-

The Examiner has stated in the instant Office Action that Pepe discloses a software, which allows the client device to preprogram the profile and upload profile to server. Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to col. 34, lines 10-21 of Pepe, the invention provides a user interface software executing on the PDA, comprising screens such as the main menu screen of Fig. 28, whereby a user may invoke icons to enter the routing (termed CallCommand) or wireless messaging services, check status of the system, such as messages waiting, current settings, and so on, and update a routing profile maintained on the PCI server, by entering data into fields, or invoking icons displayed on the PDA screen.

Fig. 28 of Pepe illustrates such a PDA screen display, comprising button icons for entering the services, reviewing the current routing profile and current status of the system. Pepe, however, does not have the capability for updating a profile maintained at the PCI server, without first connecting to the PCI server. Applicant has carefully and thoroughly studied the reference of Pepe, and has found no specific teaching or suggestion of pre-editing a routing rule set, or profile, while disconnected from the node in which the profile resides. Pepe teaches user interface screens enabling a user to update and manipulate such information residing at the PCI server, but the connection to the server must still be made and maintained prior to, and in order to affect the routing changes or view status of the system, or any other function provided by the user interface screens. Profile updates are performed only during connection between the PDA and the services, and are performed at the PCI server, via the user interface of the PDA. Applicant argues that the user interface executing on the PDA is not a personal routing software, which also executes on the base station or transceivers, as claimed by applicant. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner, in response to applicant's above argument, please indicate which specific portion of the reference of Pepe teaches or suggests pre-editing a rule set regardless of

-8-

whether a connection to the server is made, and uploading the pre-edited rules set, upon re-connection to the server.

Pepe teaches CallCommand services for managing routing actions for incoming calls, and messaging services for e-mail, voicemail, IVR, etc. Applicant argues that the CallCommand service is not a personal router application, which, as taught in applicant's invention and specifically recited in applicant claims, executes on the base station, transceivers and communicator unit. Pepe, therefore, is clearly not capable of updating a routing rule profile which, at the user's convenience, even if the mobile client device (PDA) is not connected and communicating with the base station (PCI server), and connecting to the base station at a later time to upload the updated rule set to the base station.

Although Pepe does teach that a version of the user profile, residing and maintained at the PCI server, may be "downloaded" to the PDA, the downloaded version is for presenting the profile as it is currently maintained at the PCI server for information purposes only to the user of the PDA wishing to perform updates, so that the user is informed in order to make the desired changes to the profile, at the PCI server, by invoking icons of the user interface during connection and communication to the PCI server. The actual profile, therefore, does not reside on the PDA, and a PDA user interface is not caught by Pepe to be capable of affecting changes to said profile at the PDA, prior to connecting to the PCI server. Further, Pepe does not upload an edited profile, as taught by applicant's invention as claimed, Pepe uploads specific instructions to the PCI server for changes to the profile, one at a time, to the PCI server upon connection and communication with the PCI server, and said profile changes are then affected at the PCI server. The function and capabilities between applicant's claimed personal router software and the CallCommand services of Pepe are clear, distinct and obvious.

In view of applicant's above amendments to claim 1, and arguments presented above by applicant which clearly distinguish applicant's invention as

-9-

recited in the claims as amended, over the combined art of Maxemchuk/Pepe, applicant believes claim 1 is now clearly and unarguably patentable over the combined prior art. Depending claims 3-5 are then patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims left standing and as amended and argued above are clearly shown to be patentable over the prior art either singly or in combination, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn after Final, and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Dan Kikinis

by



Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Donald R. Boys  
Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 22 2003

OFFICIAL